DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 007 CE 000 279

AUTHOR	Stein, Bruno; Miller, S. M.
TITLE	Recurrent Education: An Alternative System.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y.
PUB DATE	Aug 71
NOTE	25p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Education; *Career Education; Career Ladders; *Educational Development; Manpower Utilization; *Models
IDENTIFIERS	Recurrent Education

ABSTRACT

The front-end load model in which students enter school during their pre-productive years and then consider their schooling finished is not adequate in today's society. There presently exists several types of programs for education outside the regular school system (organizational, proprietory, manpower and anti-poverty programs, correspondence, television, continuing education at the college level, adult education below the college level, and others), but there is no continuity or development from one program to another. To the disadvantaged, the college dropout, the re-entrants to the job market, and the job shifters and upgraders, education, training, and readjustment aid is necessary at many points. While many programs are offered to remedy this situation, (open university, federally financed training allowances, redesigning job ladder, etc.), the real need is for a comprehensive, easily accessible, quality recurrent education system. (AG)

ED 082007

Recurrent Education:

An Alternative System

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Bruno Stein
Professor of Economics

S.M. Miller
Professor of Education
and Sociology
Senior Fellow Center for
Institutional Studies

One Washington Mews
New York University
New York, New York
10003

August, 1971

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CE 000 279

The Front-End Model

There is increasing dissatisfaction with the way in which education is acquired. Traditionally, education takes place during an individual's early years, after which it stops for most people. Tradition, however, is a poor excuse for maintaining a system that increasingly fails to cope with the needs of an urban and technologically oriented society. Such a society requires flexibility from its members -- an ability to adapt to rapid change. The traditional mode in education strengthens rigidity with its once-and-for-all preparation for life. It also has other undesirable social and economic consequences.

In the standard economic model of the life cycle, education is treated as an input of human capital that generally takes place during an individual's pre-productive years. This may be called the front-end load model. Investment decisions are made on the school child's behalf, out of funds provided by parents and by the taxpayers. When the child reaches his teens, full-time work becomes an alternative to school, thus altering the cost of the investment, which now expands to include the cost of the foregone work opportunity. At this stage, the model assumes that the child is a choice maker who surveys his alternatives and "rationally" decides whether or not to continue school and, if the former, what kind of schooling to pursue. To be sure, the choices are made under a set of genetic, social, and economic constraints. More to the point, they are made under the conditions of uncertainty, ignorance, and emotional turmoil that characterize adolescence. Later in life, the dissatisfied individual can blame himself and his parents for a wrong decision. As each incremental educational step becomes "higher" and more specialized, the cost of reversing erroneous choices rises exponentially. At some point, it approaches infinity. What's done can't be undone. The summation of a series of choices (whether or not to complete high school,

whether or not to go to college, what to major in, whether or not to complete college, etc., etc.) constitutes a lifetime commitment.

The economic reasoning found in the standard model is popular with policymakers. It does not require any re-examination of basic educational modes and institutions. This makes it easier to plan and to sell the plans to the body politic. The prejudice in its favor is confirmed by conclusions drawn from the usual popular and simplistic benefit-cost analysis. In the analysis, benefits are measured as the present value of the estimated earnings attributable to the added education. At any relevant rate of discount, benefits measured in this fashion are greater from a dollar added to early school programs than from a dollar added to adult education, since younger people have a longer remaining work life than those who are in mid-career. A better and broader measure of benefits would yield different results, but no such measure has yet been developed. In the meantime, hard-nosed planners will have us believe that a bad measure is better than no measure at all.

Inequalities and Inefficiencies

The standard model of the front-end educational load describes a reality that is unnecessarily grim. It is all too easy to overlook the fact that the model operates in ways that are socially inequitable and economically inefficient.

The social inequity is both vertical, along the social economic scale, and horizontal, i.e., among people of the same social economic status. The vertical inequity is obvious, and has been amply documented by data from Project Talent. There, it was found that higher-ability students of lower social economic status are less likely to go to college than lower-ability students of higher social economic status. The inequity is compounded by racial and ethnic discrimination. It would be a mistake, however, to consider the inequity as principally a race issue, as is frequently done, since, within racial and ethnic categories, it operates along social class lines.

Horizontal inequity, the unequal treatemnt of equals, may seem to be a less pressing problem, but the magnitude of this problem is really not well known. The labor market operates in mysterious ways; so that of three young men of roughly equal social class, race, mechanical aptidude, intelligence, and education, one might easily become a well-paid construction worker, the second a medium-paid auto worker, and the last an unemployed coal miner. Fortuitous as well as economic circumstances are likely to determine these occupational paths. To call them "fate" is to leave more to happenstance than is either necessary or desireble.

The economic inefficiency of the front-end load model comes from its waste of human resources. This simple proposition can manifest itself in rather sophisticated forms; in structural unemployment, for

example, which is found when a poorly trained labor force coexists with job vacancies. Or, stemming from this, in the existence of a poor trade-off between price stability and unemployment. The latter means that inflation occurs while unemployment is relatively high. Since price stability has a high priority in the minds of fiscal and monetary policymakers, unemployment rates in the 5% to 6% range may easily become permanent minima rather than temporary economic phenomena connected with recessions.

Although educational reforms are not offered as a panacea for our economic and social ills, it should be clear that the standard educational model is a poor way to do business.

Beginning Alternatives

Alternatives already exist to the front-end load model. They are a response to private and social needs, and are brought into being by both the political and the market mechanism. Thus, high school equivalence exams are available to the ambitious drop-out. Night schools offer collegiate education, some even as far as the Ph.D. (although high status schools take pride in their refusal to do this). Proprietory (i.e., profit making) schools offer training in a large number of technical skills. Employers have training programs, both formal and informal, and some sponsor educational programs not only for executives but also for workers. Manpower training programs have become a major government activity in the past decade, and are widely touted as the remedy for poverty and excessive welfare payments. Clearly, alternative models of education are in great use (although exact information on this is imperfect). Despite this, they suffer by invidious comparison with the front-end load. As the exception rather than the rule, they evoke images of the Education of H*Y*M*A*N* K*A*P*L*A*N or of specialized (and often stigmatized) social programs for the needy.

Adult education and training is usually viewed as a one-shot corrective for some particular problem rather than as a process that can be repeated as someone develops and encounters new opportunities as well as new needs. This characteristic is especially true of the publicly sponsored programs, For example, we have basic education courses for functional illiterates yet, where these exist, they are usually independent of any next step. Similarly, we have retraining programs to meet various employment crises; clients are expected to enroll in whatever may be available, without reference to advancement or to the next technological change that can disemploy them again. The retraining, often as not, is for another deadend job to replace the earlier one that disappeared. As more and more people and their employers think in terms of career ladders, the need for educational ladders becomes greater. Change may be nearer than many might think.

The existing delivery system in adult education is hopelessly chaotic. The potential student who has some need or yearning for more education finds the educational marketplace full of unconnected bits and pieces. The best he can hope for is a program here or a program there. Despite the vast amount of education that is available, there is little by way of linkage.

The term recurrent education can be used to denote a system that makes education and training available, in various doses, to individuals over their life times. The concept, developed in Sweden and defined by the Center for Educational Reform and Innovation of the Organization for European Cooperational Development, presents an alternative to conventiaonal education. On the one hand, it treats adult education as a system of services that provide a variety of educational paths. On the other hand, it differs

from the usual concept of adult education in that it treats the education of an individual as a process that is not necessarily completed during youth but may recur during the person's life.

A system of recurrent education can provide the element of flexibility needed to overcome the inequity and inefficiency that are inherent in the dominany position of the front-end load model. The beneficiaries would not merely be the system's clients, but also the entire community whose stock of human resources would be enlarged and improved.

Recurrent education, the policy suggestion that we advocate, is not ~~a Spanish castle, a captivating bus not existent pro~~ a projection for the distant future. In fact, it ~~A recurrent education system~~ may already be emerging, ~~as yet unnoticed,~~ from the chaos of continuing education, peripheral education, and the other parts of the alternative educational near-system. Only within the last few years have social policy analysts discovered this area of activity. Attempts to measure its extent have foundered, however, on the difficulty of formulating a commonly accepted definition.[1] Moreover, data are not easily available because most adult education activities are peripheral to the main purpose of the organizations engaged in this activity.[2] It is not surprising that estimates of the number of students in adult education range from 13 million[3] to 44 million,[4] with an intermediate estimate of 25 million by the National Opinion Research Center.[5] A British scholar who surveyed university adult education in New York commented with despair on the statistical confusion that marks the topic,[6] and her task was, after all, a relatively narrow one.

Nevertheless, it is useful to present a summary of existing measurements of adult education. One reason is to stimulate further research. Most data count the number of students, and

do this imperfectly. The most comprehensive of such studies, the Office of Education's Participation Survey, has not been published yet. It is a household survey, attached to the May 1969 Current Population Survey (to be repeated in 1972). Preliminary information indicates that it may have undercounted students by a very serious margin of error. There is no complete establishment survey from which to get information on the delivery system itself, its costs, and other data that would be needed for planning purposes.

A more important reason is to show that the basis for a vast recurrent education system already exists. It would not have to be built from scratch, but could make use of on-going activities.

In effect, a third-tier educational program has been evolving. It is neither the first tier of locally-run, local and state financed (with recent increases in federal funds) public education nor the second tier of private and parachial education. The two tiers constitute "the core educational institutions" with which Stanley Moses has been concerned. The third tier with many components but few connections is built of long standing activities and new programs like the federally sponsored manpower programs. Because of its diversity, the similarities in purpose and the enormity of numbers have been obscured. There has been a failure consequently to recognize the contemporary significance of third tier or recurrent education and to move rapidly towards a system.

Putting the Numbers In

We have adapted Moses' categories[7] for the purpose of grouping data on numbers of students on some consistent basis. Our eight categories are: 1) Organizational, 2) Proprietory, 3) Manpower and Anti-Poverty, 4) Correspondence, 5) Television, 6) Continuing Education at the College Level, 7) Adult Education below the College Level, and 8) "Other."

1. Organizational

This category refers to programs conducted by private business, labor unions, government, and the military to train and upgrade their employees and members. Moses estimates that approximately 14.5 million adults in 1965, were involved in organizational education programs in the United States. Yet this is, at best, a minimum estimate (aside from its outdatedness). In the case of business, the researcher soon discovers that the relevant figures may be subsumed under categories other than education and cannot easily be abstracted from company reports and similar sources. As for labor unions, one cannot even hazard a guess as to the size of this sector since not even the AFL-CIO keeps statistics on labor educational activity.

Governments engage in considerable education and training of employees. In the final yer ending in June 1969, the federal government spent at least $104 million to train slightly more than one million civil servants.[8] No aggregate figures are available for state and local governments.

Join the Army and learn a trade is an old slogan. Excluding the professional schools, service academies, and ROTC programs, the Department of Defense reports 367,858 servicemen students registered with the United States Armed Forces Institute, where general education at the high school and college levels is made available to servicement in their off-duty hours through correspondence courses.[9] An additional 240,875 servicemen are registered in other off-duty educational programs.[10] Here, the reader will note the definitional problem and its data gathering consequences. The Armed Forces Institute spans four of our categories: organizational, correspondence, continuing education at the college level, and adult education below college level. This kind of overlapping plagues the subject, and considerable disaggregation is needed to disentangle the figures

in order to avoid double counting.

Technical training programs in the Armed Forces are also very significant, but we were able to locate figures only for the Army. These show that in FY 1971 380,000 soldiers received technical non-combat training in programs ranging from 6-8 weeks to more than a year, depending on the complexity of the skill involved.[11] With the rest of the Armed Forces included, the real figure must be over half million.

A general problem in locating appropriate figures is that data on numbers of servicemen receiving training are derived from cost figures. The Department of Defense accounting system does not, by and large, break down such costs by combat and non-combat skills. Accordingly, ordinary published data from the Department of Defense must be used with care by those like us who are not interested in adult education for combat.

2. Proprietory Schools

These are private shcools, usually run for profit, which administer programs outside of the educational"core". One order of magnitude of this activity is found in the table below, from a study conducted by Harvey Belitsky of the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Estimated Attendence at Proprietory Schools, 1966 [12]

Type of School	No. of Schools	No. of Students
Trade and Technical	3,000	835,710
Business	1,300	439,500
Cosmetology	2,477	272,470
Barber	294	15,876
Total	7-4,071	1,563,556

The above numbers may be an understatement. Conversation with relevant trade associations lead us to believe that the number of trade and technical schools is closer to 7,000, with enrollments of about two

million per year.[13] Similarly, 600,000 may be a better estimate for business school attendence. For whatever it is worth, an estimate three times as great as the above 2.6 million is given by Moses, who calculates the number of students at 7.8 million in 1965.[15]

Economically, proprietory schools constitute quite a lively industry. These enterprises have met the test of the market-place: in some fashion, good or ill, they satisfy demand at prices above the cost of production, often competing with university-based continuing education programs. The profitability of the industry has attracted investment from corporations such as Bell & Howell, RCA, ITT, Time-Life, and Control Data Corporation. The willingness of customers to pay shows that there is a strong need for the services rendered by these schools even though the industry is constantly plagued by charlatans.

3. Manpower and Anti-Poverty Programs

This rubric covers the entire range of federal programs operated or sponsored by the Department of Labor and Health ,Education, and Welfare (exclusive of apprenticeship). Most of these were developed during the Kennedy-Johnson years, and operate on the proposition that manpower training is a proper antidote to unemployment, poverty, and welfare dependency. In 1969, some 8 million people took part in these programs, at a cost of $1.7 billion.[16] In practice, some of the programs are disguised forms of income transfer payments. In many cases this is unintended: it is the hope of their operators that the clients might become employed upon graduation. In a few cases, however, welfare departments put relief clients into the program in order to shift the relief payment from a federal-state account to an all-federal one. The Neighborhood Youth Corps's summer program, however, is clearly designed to "cool" hot temperature rioting. Expenditures display a seasonality that is unrelated to any conceivable educational or training need.

Considering their size and cost, anti-poverty manpower programs have been disappointing. The confusion of purpose may be a factor, but we believe that the problem lies in the very nature of the programs: short-term, narrowly vocational programs conducted to deal with immediate crises, and, in the case of the poverty population, aimed at students with more than the usual difficulty with study. A manpower training program aimed at a broader clientele would do a better job for its entire student body. A broader clientele would include workers, both employed and unemployed, above and below the poverty line; their reasons for participation would include desire for advancement, higher income, and more satisfying work.

4.Correspondence Schools

Learning-by-mail programs are conducted by a great variety of organizations, such as universities, government, and business and industry. Accordingly, data on correspondence education overlaps with data on other types of education. The interested researcher must take care to factor them out in order to avoid double counting.

The best source of data is the National Home Study Council. A 1969 survey by that organization estimated a total student body of 4.9 million, half of which consisted of students in federal and military schools.[17] Members of the National Home Study Council accounted for 1.6 million students, and non-member private schools who responded reported another 161,000. The remainder consisted of students in correspondence courses given by universities, religious groups, businesses, and miscellaneous organizations. Students taking courses in more than one school are counted twice, in some cases, so that these data, like others, need a closer look before they can be considered additive with other educational statistics.

5. Television

Moses estimates that approximately 5 million adults were involved in

televised "programs of instruction which are presented in a systematic manner and which allow for formal contact between the learner and the program." [18] This does not include documentary or other special educational programs. The medium has, of course, great potential in the form of the Open University and other approaches to schools without walls. For example, in California, a group of engineers are pursuing further studies in their employer's quarters through television lectures provided by a university which is a considerable distance away.

6. Continuing Education at the College Level

A bewildering variety of courses and activities that range from courses in "Art Styles Through the Ages" to "Sales Brokerage Practices and Techniques" to even degree programs that compete with community colleges [19] are included in this category. In 1969, an estimated 3.5 million adults were enrolled in this growing form of educational activity.[20] Many were taking the classic types of extension courses, foreign languages, art appreciateion, and modern literature. (Indeed, it is possible for individuals to put together programs that are remarkably rich in scope and content.) Others were in packaged programs that lead to specific skills and certificates, such as in practical nursing, secretarial skills, bookkeeping, factory supervision techniques, and even industrial relations. These are the same type of programs that are found in the proprietory schools. Still others were involved in courses for credit, many leading to college degrees.

Degree study for adults is available at community colleges, where the Associate degree is offered, as well as at many regular colleges and universities (particularly urban ones), where degree possibilities include the Associate, Bachelor's, Master's and even Doctorates. The availability of part-time study at any given school may be an historical accident, often having arisen from a need to fill empty buildings in the evening (the same or similar economics of overhead cost that led to the creation of many university extension divisions). Elite universities

do not as a rule engage in such activity. Thus, no one can work his way through Yale Law School at night; the adult businessmen who attend Harvard Business School are on leave -- usually paid leave -- from their firms. Unfortunately, this leads to futile imitative behavior on the part of universities and their subdivisions who seek to imporve their public images by abolishing their night schools. Alas, the simple act of excluding students in and of itself is not likely to improve either the quality or the reputation of a school, except in the eyes of its president and trustees.

7. Adult Education Below the College Level

Here is an activity that enrolls four million adults.[21] This includes a half million who are learning adult basic education.[22] We have not estimated the number of credentials and diplomas that result from all these efforts. We know, however, that a few employers are beginning to look upon the night school diploma in a new light. This reflects both an appreciation of the students' enegies and enterprise, and a realization that the standard high school diploma proves little about the ability and even literacy of a graduate.

The distribution of night school opportunities is only partly related to the demand and need for them. The tradition was established in central cities at a time when secondary education was not assumed to be universal. Suburban and other outer-city conurbations are less likely to provide such services, even at cost. The lower the level of education, the lower the income of the actual or potential students. Local governments have little or no commitment ot the education of adults and the private sector does not find low level adult education profitable. Adult basic federal subsidies along with the stigma of public assistance.

8. Other

Inevitably,we wind up with a category called "other". This includes the education activities of libraries, museums, YMCA's, religious

groups, and various community organizations, If some of this activity seems trivial, much of it is not. And in all cases, the students are people who are making an effort to grow, to develop, to do something with themselves and their lives. They operate, here and in other categories, in a chaotic market for education and usually without information about alternatives. Nowhere does one even find a complete directory of available courses. The cost to any student of collecting information is great in time and effort. Impulse buying, therefore, replaces informed choice; it is as wasteful in education as it is in consumer goods.

Who Are the Students?

Obviously, it would be very useful to parallel the previous section on the institutional sponsorship of continuing education programs with an accounting of who are the students (age, sex, previous education and work experience) in each of these programs. At this point, the best that we can do is to try to characterize in broad strokes the kinds of students involved. The four overlapping categories we employ are the disadvantaged, the college dropouts, the re-entrants, and the job shifters and ~~the~~ upgraders. It is important to realize that just as education has become non-continuous so have work patterns, thereby requiring education, training and readjustment aid at many points.

The Disadvantaged

The poor and the black (the educationally deprived) have had particular trouble with schools. Consequently, their occupational and income potentials have been severely blunted. In the Sixties, many had entered programs, whether labelled educational or not, which sought to improve their competitive

position in the labor market. With the strong emphasis on equality of opportunity and social mobility and with the continuing difficulties of schools in working effectively with the disadvantaged, they are a large body of clients for recurrent education programs. Recurrent education is especially important to this group.

The College Dropout

Many youths are dropping out of college; four continuous years is not the only model for a degree; many start but never finish college. Continuing education programs provide later opportunities to get a degree or to move into more specialized training without a degree but with the chance for higher income. A 24 twenty four year old or a 34 thirty four year old completing college or getting specialized training is different from an 18 eighteen year-old in a similar position. New institutions have been developing to respond to these new needs.

Re-entrants

A surprising number of people do not work continuously from school leaving to retirement. When they reenter the labor market, they frequently need to be "refreshed" or "retooled." Obviously, this situation applies to a growing number of women who reenter the labor market after their children are 3 three or 6 six or 18 eighteen. Less obviously, there are many people in institutions (prisons, hospitals) who reenter the work sphere and need training (while in the institution or later) to facilitate their employment. And perhaps we should begin to think of counter-culture youth who may age into returning to the "straight" world and are occupationally disadvantaged if they do not have training and education then available to them.

Shifters and Upgraders

Technological changes and unemployment may lead many to learn new skills. Many employed blue collar as well as white collar workers engage in additional training in order to be upgraded into better paid jobs. Indeed, it may well be that the upgrading of blue collar workers ~~may~~ will be one of the most important uses of recurrent education in the next years. (France now has extensive plans for the retraining of already working blue collar workers.) The notion is spreading that there should not be deadened people, that better paid, more interesting jobs should be available to many, rather than restricted to those who received higher education when young and began on the job promotion ladder rather than the low ceiling route. In the future, a new group is likely to become important: people who want to shift jobs just to get variety. Thus, horizontal mobility as well as vertical mobility desires may engender considable retraining efforts for an older generation.

It is clear that a wide spectrum of individuals are involved or may be involved in recurrent education. There will be need not only for a broad range of programs but for interconnected activities that facilitate shifting from one set of education to another.

(Our discussion is in terms of the United States but we suspect that recurrent education may be even more important for developing societies, Frequently these countries train a select few in skills that are inappropriate to technical needs and provide no means for later education; in some nations there is an over-production of particular skills, again with no change for retraining. Social mobility

is increasingly considered an important element of social justice, but the front-end load model serves to limit mobility opportunities. There is considerable waste from the narrow view of investment in (unutilized and unutilizable) human capital and from the broader view of developing individuals. Flexible, adaptive recurrent education would seem much more useful in developing countries than standard, fixed curriculum, traditional, front-end models.)

Constructing an Alternative

The alternative to the front-end load model exists as correctives to deficiencies in the core schools. These correctives develop because of individuals' demand for different schooling arrangements and governmental and employers' responses to special economic and social needs. There is ample evidence of the shortcoming of the standard system. It is worth reviewing some of the shortcomings of both the standard and alternative systems.

Education is a long-term continuous proces.. This is obvious to any working professional who knows that he cannot afford to stop learning. It is true, if less obviously, of others. To concentrate the learning process into a few years of life is to engage in the absurd: much of what happens in school does not constitute learning, and much of learning takes place outside the schools.

The in-school front-end learning process has many functions aside frbm the transmission of knowledge. It is an aging vat for young people prior to their entry into the labor market. It allocates educational capital, and therefore income, in a way that largely preserves the existing

income distibution. It gives youngsters a tolerance for tedium that is useful for boring jobs. It provides credentials that do not necessarily reflect the possession of a set of abilities for any particular job.

Some of the learning that takes place outside of school is directly valuable. Anyone on a new job spends time in learning. This is often formalized, dignified with the title "on-the-job-training" and at times even credentialed. However, the worker who has learned all he needs to know about a job is in a dead-end job. There is little point or pressure for paying him more, and many jobs dead-end at an early stage and at low wages.

The alternative, as presently structured, suffers from a variety of faults: promises that will not be kept ("train at home to earn $10,000 in your spare time"), foolish demands for educational credentials,[23] and far too frequently, tragically low-caliber training. Anyone connected with manpower programs or continuing education can tell anecdotes about mickey mouse courses. Why then do we believe that these diverse activities have promise if viewed as one system?

1) The absence of a notion of a full system encourages a <u>low degree of comprehensiveness</u> in programming. The individual may not be able to find in his or her locale all the components needed for development.

2) An emphasis on training by particular employers is likely to lead to the development of skills with <u>low transferability</u>. Where the program is oriented to the trainee's employer or prospective employer, the skills developed are likely to be narrow and specific, with

limited capacity to be useful in other employment situations. What is needed are useful, highly transferable skills which at the same time meet a specific employer's needs.

3) An atomistic system limits the development of a long run program for the individual; what is required is the meshing of educational and training facilities with the needs of individuals as they emerge over time.

4) The absence of a system makes it difficult to impose quality controls over programs and to connect them effectively with each other.

5) When programs are discrete, disconnected activities they may become narrowly vocationalized so that broader considerations of developing the citizen and social competence of individuals get little attention.

Problems of Recurrent Education

What are some principle issues then, in the development of a system of recurrent education?

1) Can we achieve systematization without stifling the innovative energies that are now inherent in the unorganized adult educational system? Its very haphazard quality may, as some argue, by a source of strength rather than weakness.

2) How would the rigidities and faddism of public education be overcome? After Sputnik we spent billions to expand higher education for the young--the front-end load~~-now~~, Now we have sent men to the moon and we have a surplus of college graduates and Ph.Ds (but not of nurses or MDs). Are we prepared to allocate education expenditures

differently with less emphasis on the front-end and more on continuing education? We are close to guaranteeing all children 14 to 16 years of education. Need it be confined to children and must it be all at once? How should funds be allocated between front-end and continuing education?

3) Won't the possibility of regaining educational opportunities later in life encourage young people to be even less interested in school and lower their ability later to utilize educational possibilities? At the time, won't the pressure be lifted from the core school institutions to change and improve if those in difficulty with these institutions quietly depart with everyone's confidence that somehow they will manage in the future to compensate for their present educational deprivation? Could a general result be that credentialism would be even more emphasized since education would still play an important role and would be seemingly available to all persons at some point?

4) Recurrent education is expensive because of the lost time from work (opportunity costs) for adults going full time and is burdensome for those working fulltime and also goint to school. Are there special adaptations like work sabbaticals (secured by the United Steelworkers' Union in collective bargaining) which can overcome these difficulties?

5) What is a desirable administrative arrangement for the recurrent education approach? To what extent should there be state-local control and finance as is true of much of public education today? Should federal financing and thereby influence be much more important than in contemporary public education? Since the students are adults and the

emphasis is less on a set curriculum, should there not be high student involvement in decisions?

These are difficult questions, They make us aware that recurrent education is not an easy panacea and that it will be difficult to build on a systematic basis. On the other hand, they do not shake our confidence that recurrent education should play a significant role. One evidence of its vitality is the variety of activity now occurring.

New proposals for organizing and financing the continuing education of those in the labor market are emerging with increased frequency: the open university for non-residential, non-fulltime students; a federally financed training allowance that individuals can offer employers; collective bargaining provisions for educational subsidies to workers; re-designing job ladders and training to promote greater mobility; upgrading programs, including the utilization of the fifth day as an education training segment in firms with a four-day week. These proposals reflect an understanding and occasionally explicit, that training and education need not be a once-in-a-lifetime activity and offer ways of developing recurrent education.

But there are threats in this very vitality. While innovation and experiment are desirable, we fear that there is a great danger that the nation will proliferate the interesting small demonstration project and substitute them for the outlays for a comprehensive, easily accessible, quality recurrent education system. Instead of serving as the foundation for a full recurrent education system useful to all, they may prevent its emergence by implying more than they deliver.

It is getting to the time to have a national vision about a system, not bits and pieces, of recurrent education which operates as a realistic alternative to the front-end model for many different kinds of Americans.

IV. NOTES

1) Stanley Moses, The Learning Force: An Approach to the Politics of Education. (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Research Corporation, 1970), p.22. The concept of the "learning force" was developed by Bert M. Gross.

2) U. S. Office of Education, Noncredit Activities in Institutions of Higher Education, 1967-8. (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1970),p.iii

3) Richard W. Cortright, Asst. Director, Division of Adult Education of the National Education Association. Letter from him dated April 9, 1971, in our files.

4) Moses, loc.cit.

5) John W. C. Johnstone and Ramon J. Rivera, Volunteers in Learning. (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.,1965), pp.1-2.

6) Caroline Ellwood, Survey of University Adult Education in the Metropolitan Area of New York. (New York: New York University, School of Continuing Education,1967), p.2.

7) Moses, loc.cit. We have expanded Moses's categories from six to eight.

8) U. S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Training, Employee Training in the Federal Service. (Washington: U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1970), pp. 95, 124-6.

9) C. A. Ducey, Capt.,U.S. Navy, Office of Asst. to the Secretary of Defense for Education. Telephone conversation on April 15, 1971. We are indebted to Catherine Manning for obtaining this and other information.

10) Ibid.

11) D. B. Quigley, Capt., U.S. Navy, Deputy Director for Enlisted Manpower Management Systems, Office of the Asst. Secretary of Defense. Letter from him dated April 21, 1971, in our files.

12) A. Harvey Belitsky, Private Vocational Schools and Their Students. (Cambridge: Schenkman, 1969), p. 9.

13) Philip Taylor, National Association of Trade and Technical Schools. Telephone conversation on April 13, 1971.

14) Telephone Conversation on April 13, 1971, with representative of the United Business Schools Association.

15) Moses, op. cit., p.22.

16) Manpower Information Service, Reference File, (Washington, D. C.: Bureau of National Affairs, 1970), pp. 21:1006-9.

17) Robert Taylor, National Homes Study Council. Telephone conversation on April 13, 1971.

18) Moses, op.cit., p. 24.

19) New York University, School of Continuing Education and Extension Services, Bulletin Spring 1971.

20) Report issued jointly by the Association of University Evening Colleges and the National University Extension Association for its members in 1969, pp. 27-31. This is based on a survey and involves some double counting of students. The National Center for Educational Statistics show 6.5 million registrations in continuing education programs of colleges and universities of which 5.6 million were in non-credit programs (U.S. Office of Education, Noncredit Activities in Institutions of Higher Education, 1967-68, Washington: U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1970, Table A-1.). The reader is warned not to confuse registrations with the number of students.

21) Richard W. Cortright, Asst. Director, Division of Adult Education of the National Education Association. Letter from him dated April 9, 1971, in our files.

22) U. S. Office of Education, Adult Basic Education Program Statistics. (Washington: U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1970), p. 1.

23) "Breaking One Credential Barrier" in S. M. Miller and Frank Reisman, Social Class and Social Policy, Basic Book, 1968, and Ivan Berg, Education and Jobs ; The Great Training Robbery, Praeger, 1970.